

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed **November 10, 2003**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-30. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 21, 22, 29, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold (USPN 6,275,848, hereinafter "Arnold"). Claims 3-5, 8, 13-15, 18, 23-25, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold in view of Eldridge et al. (USPN 6,397,261, hereinafter "Eldridge"). Claims 6, 16 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold in view of Pollack (USPN 6,505,236, hereinafter "Pollack") in further view of Trenbeath et al. (USPN 6,324,587, hereinafter "Trenbeath") in further view of Birrell et al. (USPN 6,092,101, hereinafter "Birrell"). Claims 7, 17 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold in view of Birrell.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable over Arnold. Applicant respectfully points out that Arnold teaches **granting or denying access** depending upon whether the recipient is on an access list (see Arnold, col. 4 lines 43-57). Note that the removal of a recipient from the access list does not provide proof of receipt because deletion of the recipient from the access list can be at the instruction of the recipient (see Arnold, col. 4, lines 48-51). Removal of the recipient from the access list can only prove that someone with access to the access list removed the recipient from the access list.

In contrast, the present invention discloses providing **proof of receipt** of the **contents** of the attachment using cryptographic techniques (see page 10, line 16 to page 11, line 2 of the instant application). These cryptographic techniques involve delivering an encrypted version of the attachment, receiving a receipt for the encrypted version of the attachment, and sending the decryption key for the attachment. Providing proof of receipt of the contents of the attachment is advantageous because the recipient cannot deny having received the

contents of the attachment. There is nothing within Arnold, either explicit or implicit, which would suggest an advantage for providing proof of receipt of the contents of the attachment using cryptographic techniques.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to clarify that the present invention provides proof of receipt of the contents of the attachment using cryptographic techniques. These amendments find support on page 10, line 16 to page 11, line 2 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-20, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 22-30, which depend upon claim 21, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler

Registration No. 47, 615

Date: January 28, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665